

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-7, and 9 drawn to compounds and insecticidal composition of the formula I wherein X is a N Y is C=O, p and q are both 2 each, Ra, R2, R3, R4 are all H.

Group II, claim(s) 1, 3-7, drawn to compounds and insecticidal compositions of the formula I wherein X is a O, Y is bond, p and q are both 2 each, Ra, R2, R3, R4 are all H.

Group III, claim(s) 1, 3-7, drawn to compounds and insecticidal compositions of the formula I not included in group I or II. A further election of a single disclosed species is required.

Group IV, claim(s) 8, drawn to compound of formula II, p and q are each 2, Ra, R2, R3, R4 are all H.

Group V, claim(s) 8, drawn to compounds of formula III, wherein X is a N Y is C=O, p and q are both 2 each, Ra, R2, R3, R4 are all H.

Group VI, claim(s) 8, drawn to compound of formula II, not included in group IV. A further election of a single disclosed species is required. May be subject to further restriction.

Group VII, claim(s) 8, drawn to compounds of formula III, not included in group V. A further election of a single disclosed species is required. This group may be subject to further restriction.

Group VIII-X, claim(s) 10, drawn to a method of combatting and controlling insects. Acarines nematodes or molluscs, limited to the scope of one of the groups I-III.

The groups of inventions listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Art Unit: 1625

(f) Markush Practice. The situation involving the so-called Markush practice wherein a single claim defines alternatives (chemical or non-chemical) is also governed by Rule 13.2. In this special situation, the requirement of a technical interrelationship and the same or corresponding special technical features as defined in Rule 13.2, shall be considered to be met when the alternatives are of a similar nature.

(i) When the Markush grouping is for alternatives of chemical compounds, they shall be regarded as being of a similar nature where the following criteria are fulfilled:

(A) all alternatives have a common property or activity, **and**

(B)(1) a common structure is present, i.e., a significant structural element is shared by all of the alternatives, or

(B)(2) in cases where the common structure cannot be the unifying criteria, all alternatives belong to a recognized class of chemical compounds in the art to which the invention pertains.

(ii) In paragraph (f)(i)(B)(1), above, the words significant structural element is shared by all of the alternatives refer to cases where the compounds share a common chemical structure which occupies a large portion of their structures, or in case the compounds have in common only a small portion of their structures, the commonly shared structure constitutes a structurally distinctive portion in view of the existing prior art. The structural element may be a single component or a combination of individual components linked together.

The different R's, X and Y substituents have so many variables with the heterocyclic and non-hetero groupings , they have different bonding and properties , and have achieved a different status in the art , and is burdensome to search and hence are objected to as being drawn to an improper Markush group on the grounds of lack of a common nucleus. The terms R's , X Y R4, R8, are so broad in scope that a prior art reference anticipating the claims with respect to one member under 35 USC 102(b) would not render obvious the same claims under 35 USC 103a with respect to another member

See WO 99/09984 Richard Buddhu et al.

WO 99/64002 Ravi Nargund et al. cited on the search report.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of

election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention or species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions have unity of invention (37 CFR 1.475(a)), applicant must provide reasons in support thereof. Applicant may submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. Where such evidence or admission is provided by applicant, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i). Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RITA DESAI whose telephone number is (571)272-0684. The examiner can normally be reached on Maxiflex time..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rita J. Desai/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

July 5, 2011.